

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

April 9, 1997

LR 20

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR WITEK: ...here in the state of Nebraska for...for some type of equality in our school districts here in the state of Nebraska, and leave that so that we're able to work that out without having interference from our courts. Anyone whose been aware of some of the court battles that have occurred in New Jersey recently, they are continually in courtroom battles there. They will come back with some kind of a proposal, and the courts will strike it down. It's a very costly process. It's a very time-consuming process. The way we have things now in the state of Nebraska, with that simple school financing language and with the attempt that we make here in the Legislature in statute, I think is the best course of action. While the other states are embroiled in all of these expensive, time-consuming lawsuits on this issue, we've been able to avoid them. I think if we go ahead and put this in, and this is just a couple of the cases...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time. Thank you, Senator. Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yes, Madam President, members of the body. I just wanted to comment a little bit on the issue of school finance and whether this will...passage of this...placing this in our constitution would result in the dire consequences Senator Witek is talking about. First of all, to make it clear, most cases dealing with school funding have been challenged and brought under the education clause of an individual state constitution. I'd go further and say most of those cases, if there's anything consistent in those cases, it is where you have a set of judges who have a desire to find a state funding formula unconstitutional. They'll find that in their education language. There are many of those states that don't have a particularly stronger education article than we have in Nebraska, where the judges have reached out in many ways to declare school finance formulas unconstitutional. In our state, our court to date has indicated they don't have a desire to do this. They were given the opportunity in the Gould case, they chose not to do this. Second point I'd like to make is that it's my layperson's understanding that most of these interpretations are dealt around the concept of what is and what